

REMARKS

Claims 8-25 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 8, 16, and 22 have been amended herein. A listing of claims can be found on pages 2-5. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

In the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2005, claims 8-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boden, *et al.* (US 5,930, 512) in view of Lau (US 6,598,219 B1). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The cited references do not teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in the herein amended claims. In particular, the claimed invention provides a scheduling component that can *implement business processes independent of business operations and their related technology specific applications*. For example, a restaurant business could utilize the business process of a car manufacturing plant even though the technologies utilized for their ordering, production, and inventory systems are different.

Although Boden, *et al.* discloses a system in which a web server and a work server are utilized for business process modeling. Boden, *et al.* does not disclose a system in which the business process model is *independent* of the business operations and their respective technologies. Boden, *et al.* discloses a "workflow model [that] is a complete representation of a process, comprising a process diagram and the settings that define the logic behind the components of the diagram" (*See e.g.* col. 4, ll. 16-18). Thus, Boden, *et al.* discloses a system that requires modification of the process model, which has been tailored to the implemented technology, in order to utilize a business process model for a different business. In contrast, the subject invention as claimed discloses a process model that employs a dataflow diagram to define a flow of business processes that are *independent* of the technology specific applications. Therefore, a business process can be utilized across multiple businesses regardless of implementations of operation and technology.

Neither Boden, *et al.* nor Lau, individually or in combination, teach or disclose all aspects of applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 8, 16, and 22. Accordingly, the claims as amended are believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP102US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731